## Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting Monday, July 23, 2007

1. <u>CONVENE</u>: 7:10 p.m.

2. <u>FLAG SALUTE</u>: Member Ezzy Ashcraft

3. ROLL CALL: President Cook, Vice President Kohlstrand, Ezzy Ashcraft,

Lynch, Mariani and McNamara.

Board member Cunningham was absent.

Also present were Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas, Assistant City Attorney Donna Mooney, Supervising Planner Doug Garrison, Planner III Dennis Brighton, Planner I Simone Wolter, Obeid Khan, Public Works.

## 4. <u>MINUTES</u>:

a. Minutes for the meeting of July 9, 2007.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that page 7, paragraph 4, should read, "Board member Cunningham noted that he did not want to see the uses in Alameda intensified so much that traffic would come to a stop." She noted that while Board member Cunningham was not present, but she would like to clarify that statement.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the second to last paragraph on page 9 should be changed to read, "Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she had visited the gaming store and met the owner, and that it was very attractive inside. She recommended that when discussing how the Bridgeside Center could be made nicer, the Board should emphasize that it is not criticizing the hard-working individual business owners."

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that the last paragraph of page 8 addressed the resolution of adoption for the gas station, and read that the Planning Board had approved a total of 18 pumping stations, and that the applicant proposed 24-hour operations and the sale of beer and wine. She believed the resolution should read 12 pumping stations; she understood that the request for the sale of beer and wine had been withdrawn. She requested that staff ensure that all of the conditions were correct.

Board member Mariani noted that page 7 stated that she agreed with Vice President Cook's comments. She would like to elaborate specifically that her objection dealt with the non-peak hours, which include times when children are just getting out of school, walking around, or riding bikes; parents were driving children to Towne Centre for after-school activities during those times. She wished to state that the gas station was in close proximity to the hospital and many convalescent homes with patients walking around the area. She felt this was a major safety concern.

President Cook noted that page 7, should be changed to read, "She was concerned about the area around Wells Fargo, and did not feel comfortable making findings 4 and 10 which addressed whether the project would have negative impacts on the adjacent uses."

Board member McNamara moved approval of the minutes as amended.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote -6. Absent -1 (Cunningham). The motion passed.

## 5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION: None.

## 6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

a. Future Agendas

Mr. Thomas provided an update on future agenda items.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft whether the September 10, 2007, meeting would address green building codes during the review of the local action plan for the Climate Protection Task Force, Mr. Thomas replied that draft green building codes will not be available for review at that time. Staff anticipated laying out a "game plan" for getting to those codes, and has drafted a Request for Qualifications for qualified consultants.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired why this was such a complicated process, and noted that only Alameda and Piedmont were the only cities in Alameda County that have not enacted a green building ordinance.

Mr. Thomas replied that staff resources and prioritization of time was a major factor in what projects staff is able to accomplish. He added that the Board may look at the work program on August 28, 2007.

Vice President Kohlstrand recalled that Councilmember Matarrese stated that the Planning Department and Planning Board should make some specific recommendations to come to the City Council.

Board member Lynch recalled Board member Ezzy Ashcraft's original statement about the green building ordinance and its complexities, and believed he heard a certain amount of frustration about the process. He suggested that the frustration should not be directed at staff, given the workload and staffing levels. He noted that he was involved with two projects in jurisdictions that did not have green building ordinances, but were part of the City's development guidelines. He noted that even if discussion of the ordinance were to begin at this meeting, it would not be completed for 2007. He suggested that a policy paper be produced stating that individuals submitting applications to the Planning Department should do their best to incorporate green building principles and guidelines. He suggested that relevant websites be included, and did not think those individuals or companies should not move to the head of the line.

b. Zoning Administrator Report

Mr. Thomas provided the Zoning Administrator report.

- 7. ORAL COMMUNICATION: None.
- 8. <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>: None.
- 9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:
- 9-A. DP07-0003 Alameda Landing Mixed Use Development Project Applicant: Catellus Development Group, a ProLogis Company and the City of Alameda. The applicant requests Development Plan approval for landscaping and public right-of-way improvements along Mitchell Mosely Avenue, Fifth Street, and Willie Stargell Avenue. The site is located along the western end of the former FISC Site (Tract 7884) within the M-X Mixed Use Planned Development Zoning District. (AT/DV)

Mr. Thomas presented the staff report, and noted that the landscape plans for the three new major public roads would be addressed during this item. Staff recommended approval of the landscape plans.

Ms. Linda Gates, Gates and Associates, landscape architect, displayed a PowerPoint presentation to describe the streetscape plan for this project.

Mr. Rene Behan, SWA Group, landscape architect, continued the presentation of the master plan.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Diana Thomas, General Manager, Mariner Square Athletic Club, 2227 Mariner Square Loop, noted that while they were very excited about the project as presented to the City, and about the Alameda Landing as a whole, they did have some concerns regarding the landscaping proposal, particularly the extra triangle of land as displayed. She noted that was part of the property that the club occupied at 2227 Mariner Square Loop, as well as Bayside Pavilion. She noted that the easement rights were still unclear after meetings with the City, in addition to the traffic easements. In addition, the current extension of Willie Stargell, and how it was presented, would prohibit access to the current property that they occupied, as well as the current businesses. She expressed concern about the tenants in the property that had a loading dock and loading bay, and that the access would be lost. She was concerned that the secondary driveway would increase or reconfigure the traffic through their parking lot.

Ms. Kathy Wagner, owner, Mariner Square Athletic Club and Bayside Pavilion, noted that she was now the owner of the property located at 2203 and 2227 Mariner Square Loop; her property was adjacent to two sides of the Catellus/ProLogis project. She noted that she had been excited about this project and had attended most of the meetings. She had met with staff earlier in the day, and expressed concerns about the plans. She requested that the Planning Board deny approval of the landscaping plan and site improvements in its entirety for Fifth Street, Willie Stargell and Mitchell Avenue extensions. She noted that the plan of the road on Stargell did not allow access into her existing business, and she had responsibilities to her existing tenants, who had access through Tinker Avenue, which would become Willie Stargell. She added that large semi trucks had access to drop off food for Gourmet Rail Services, which provided the food for Amtrak Trains. She noted that would cause a problem in their parking area if they were to lose access from Tinker Avenue. She understood that the City had not yet acquired the property from the College of Alameda, and believed it would be premature for the City to approve a plan when it did not yet own that property. She was concerned that things may change dramatically if the City did not acquire that property. She believed that if the City approved any portion of the street improvements, it would affect what happens on the Mariner Square property. Therefore, she did not believe the City should approve any of the landscaping or site improvements on Fifth Street, Willie Stargell or Mitchell Avenue until more discussion and planning has taken place.

Mr. Gail Wetzork, 3452 Capella Lane, spoke in support of this project, and believed it was very well done. With respect to the area property owners, he believed this project will beautify the Northern Waterfront and will economically benefit the City. He believed this was the best version of the project that had come before the City.

Ms. Melodie Marr, Alameda Chamber of Commerce, 1416 Park Avenue, spoke in support of this project. She suggested removing Willie Stargell, and approving the other two streets in order to allow staff to work with Ms. Wagner on Stargell. She had long been concerned about the lack of facilities in Alameda where events could be held, and would like the project to move forward.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff brought the three streets forward with one staff report because they felt it was important to ensure that the landscaping materials were consistently and logically organized with respect to the planting and landscape plans for the three separate projects. There was otherwise no real reason why all three streets should be held up over the concerns of a portion of the landscape plan for one street. He noted that the Mitchell Extension was a required portion of this project to serve the Clif Bar project. He noted that Fifth Street was also essential, and that the City must move forward on that street. Staff was aware of the potential uncertainties with the acquisition of the land for the Tinker project. Staff did not see the need to hold up all three streets over the issue of the easement. He noted that the City owned a street easement across Ms. Wagner's property, which was specifically for the extension and expansion of Tinker/Willie Stargell. He described the easement, which was used for parking and access; he noted that it was a paved but fairly

unimproved area. Under the proposed plan, both properties owned by Ms. Wagner would have direct access onto Mariner Square Loop; they would not have access from Willie Stargell. He suggested that while direct access could not be provided, that a joint driveway or access could be provided from the Stargell driveway for the Alameda Landing project and to provide a secondary access for Ms. Wagner's properties.

President Cook suggested that the Planning Board discuss Fifth Street and Mitchell Moseley while staff prepared a displayed for Willie Stargell.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that she was fairly comfortable with the landscaping treatment on both Mitchell Mosely and Fifth Street. Her concerns with Stargell had less to do with the landscaping plan than the street configuration. She noted that the resolution stated that the Board should consider both the "landscape and site improvements for the public right of way." She wanted to ensure that whatever was in the public right of way was adequate to meet everyone's needs.

Board member McNamara stated that she liked the landscaping plan for both Fifth Street and Mitchell Moseley, and believed they were laid out very well.

President Cook inquired about how the placement of the trees related to any view corridors between the buildings, which she would like to be as open as possible to the waterfront.

Mr. Behan replied that at every view corridor, there would be cottonwood trees to act as a formal indicator of pedestrian walkways. The trees would be limbed up high enough so that would be visually apparent to pedestrians.

President Cook believed the understory of ornamental trees on Fifth Street were spaced far apart, and inquired about the distance between the trees.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she generally liked the plan, and inquired who was responsible for the maintenance of the landscaping. Mr. Thomas replied that on the public rights of way, the project pays the City to maintain the landscaping of the private areas.

In response to an inquiry by Member Ezzy Ashcraft whether anyone used Neptune Park, and whether staff proposed a redesign for the park to make it more usable, Ms. Gates noted that it was underutilized and that a senior housing project adjacent to it used it occasionally. At this time, there are no walkways through the park, and that they planned to clean it up visually to enhance the existing monumentation/flag area, add new lighting, create an area to allow maintenance trucks to be parked off-site, and to add the walkway to improve the connectivity of the circulation.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook regarding the understory trees along Fifth Street, Mr. Behan replied that there would be two palm trees and an evergreen. He added that they wished to provide room for the lighting as well. President Cook noted that she wanted there to be a consistent understory along Fifth Street to provide comfort for pedestrians and people who wished to sit.

Vice President Kohlstrand requested that the understory be increased without jeopardizing the lighting scheme. Mr. Behan believed that request could be accommodated.

Mr. Thomas displayed the site plan, which illustrated the location of the properties, the City easement and the circulation on the site.

President Cook noted that the issues surrounding access from Willie Stargell would probably not be resolved at this meeting.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft regarding the purpose of the plazas at each corner, Mr. Thomas replied that they were basically widened sidewalks, and that one of the intents for the new intersection at Willie Stargell and Mariner Square Loop was to create a new entrance to the College of Alameda and to facilitate pedestrian access between the College and sites north of the College. The plaza on Ms. Wagner's property was planned to be somewhat larger in order to design a more visually attractive and noticeable intersection.

In response to an inquiry by Board member McNamara whether the replacement of the medians by landscaping on Webster Street would reduce the street width, Mr. Thomas replied that it would not.

In response to an inquiry by Board member McNamara whether there would be a signal light at the corner of Webster Street and Willie Stargell, Mr. Thomas confirmed that there would be a signal at the new intersection. Another signal would be placed at Stargell and Mariner Square Loop.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook whether there would be a signal across from Neptune Park, Ms. Gates replied that there would be a signal at the location.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that as a long-time transportation planner, she was often cautious about some of the CalTrans standards that are imposed in urban areas, which she saw occurring here. She was very concerned about that, and noted that much more area was being devoted to roadway. She believed it was a good idea to have a pedestrian signal at Stargell. She was very concerned about the access to the adjacent properties, as well as the realignment of the street. With that realignment, concerns were being raised about the north-south driveway on the Catellus site and its safety. She was concerned that a problem was being created.

Vice President Kohlstrand inquired whether there would be a sidewalk on both sides of Stargell. Mr. Thomas replied that there was a sidewalk on the north side of Stargell from the College of Alameda to the west. He further discussed the rationale behind the number of lanes and the street alignment.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that she had met with members of City staff and the Catellus team earlier in the week, and noted that this street was not designed with parking;

there had been some question about the driveway for Catellus and future installation of a right-hand turn. She suggested that if the street had been designed with parking, that would have been an option for creating a turn pocket. She would rather see something more similar to Santa Clara Avenue than Tilden Way.

Mr. Obeid Khan, Public Works, noted that while the intersection of Webster and Willie Stargell was under CalTrans jurisdiction, in order to design the street so that Stargell comes off Webster, it would not be desirable for a car to exit from the dark Tube into Alameda, with a queue extending into the Tube.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that the inclination was to build it to the highest standards, but she would like to hear more debate about the issue.

Board member Mariani acknowledged the frustration of not having a visual illustration, and believed there should have been more information to address the neighbors' issues.

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to adopt the draft Planning Board Resolution to approve the Development Plan for landscaping and public right-of-way improvements along Mitchell Mosely Avenue and Fifth Street, with the added condition of re-examining the understory on Fifth Street to incorporate more pear trees.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft wished to add a condition to incorporate the Bay Friendly Landscape Guidelines throughout the project, as set forth in the publication *Bay Friendly Landscape Guidelines*, available at <a href="https://www.stopwaste.org">www.stopwaste.org</a>.

The amendment was acceptable to the maker of the motion.

Mr. Behan noted that he would like to examine the document before agreeing to the condition. They had discussed using sustainable materials in their project specifications, as well as using indigenous materials for planting and hardscape.

Board member Lynch suggested modifying the condition to include the words "where appropriate" in incorporating the guidelines in the landscape plan.

Mr. Behan noted that he agreed in spirit, but was concerned that the document may make recommendations that they could not incorporate, such as using reclaimed water.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she had raised this issue previously, and added that while the City's green building ordinances were not yet in place, she noted that the website was related to the Alameda Waste Management Authority. She noted that many Bayfriendly landscaping guidelines used by other Bay Area communities were delineated, and would appreciate the applicant reading it with that in mind. She was willing to use the word "suggested," but would like those practices to be adhered to as much as possible.

Mr. Thomas noted that Finding 1 contained a typo on page 2, paragraph 1, and that it should be amended to read, "... and the proposed landscape *plans* Master Plan will not result in any new environmental impact..."

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired about approval of plans for property not yet acquired by the City. She also agreed with Board member Mariani's comments about the lack of visuals available for examination with regard to issues raised by Mariner Square Athletic Club.

Board member Lynch inquired about the significance of having the Stargell project moving forward for the City.

Mr. Thomas replied that there were still major steps to accomplish before construction could begin.

Board member Lynch noted that because further resolution was needed, that would take time; there were also City budget implications. He believed a project of this significance would also work its way through the Transportation Commission, and suggested that once those items were resolved, that staff inform the Planning Board at that time. Mr. Thomas noted that staff could not commit to when the retail center would be brought before the Board, and added that the land had not yet been acquired.

Board member Mariani seconded the motion, with the following voice vote -6. Absent: 1 (Cunningham). The motion passed.

Board member Mariani left the meeting following the vote.

9-B. General Plan Amendment, GPA07-0003/Rezoning R07-0001- Applicant: City of Alameda - 201 Mosley Avenue. A General Plan Amendment and Rezoning of an existing park/open space area of approximately 10.77 acres. The site is currently listed as Medium Density Residential on the General Plan Diagram and is zoned R-4-G, Neighborhood Residential (Special Government) Zoning District. The General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would not change the use of the existing open space area. The site is located north of Singleton and Mosley Avenues. (DB)

Mr. Brighton presented the staff report, and recommended approval of this item.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to adopt the draft Planning Board Resolution to recommended that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment and Rezoning of an existing park/open space area of approximately 10.77 acres. The site is currently listed as Medium Density Residential on the General Plan Diagram and is zoned R-4-G, Neighborhood Residential (Special Government) Zoning District. The General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would not change the use of the existing open space area.

Vice President Kohlstrand seconded the motion, with the following voice vote -5. Absent: 2 (Mariani and Cunningham). The motion passed.

- 10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.
- 11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:
- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board Member Mariani).

Board member Mariani was not in attendance to present this report. Mr. Thomas noted that the next meeting would be held September 20, 2007.

b. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Vice President Kohlstrand).

Vice President Kohlstrand advised that there had been no meetings since her last report.

c.. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Climate Protection Task Force (Board Member Cunningham).

Board member Cunningham was not in attendance to present this report.

12. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>: 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary City Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the August 27, 2007, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.